

# INTEGRITY

September 1953 - 25¢

7-12



HIS ISSUE: WOMAN

# C O N T E N T S

EDITORIAL	- - - - -	1
THE ROLE OF WOMAN		
By GERALD VANN, O.P.	- - - - -	2
PEOPLE ARE PEOPLE ARE PEOPLE		
By MARION MITCHELL STANCIOFF	- - - - -	12
EDITH STEIN ON WOMANHOOD		
By JOHN M. OESTERREICHER	- - - - -	21
THE LATTER DAY		
By ELAINE MALLEY	- - - - -	29
BE PRESENT!		
By ABIGAIL Q. MCCARTHY	- - - - -	36
BOOK REVIEWS	- - - - -	44

INTEGRITY is published by lay Catholics and  
dedicated to the task of discovering the new  
synthesis of RELIGION and LIFE for our times.

**Vol. 7, No. 12**

**September 1953**

Published monthly by Integrity Publishing Co., Inc., 157 East 38th Street,  
New York 16, N. Y., MU-5-8125. Edited by Dorothy Dohen.

Re-entered as Second Class Matter May 11, 1950 at the

Post Office in New York, N. Y. under the Act

of March 3, 1879. All single copies 25¢

each; yearly subscriptions: Domestic

\$3.00, Canadian \$3.50,

Foreign \$4.00.

INTEGRITY is indexed in *THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX*

## EDITORIAL

**E**VERY week—or so it has seemed for the past few months—a new book or article is published on woman. Some try to prove that she is superior to man; others hold that she is forced to be inferior because she is denied sexual and economic equality with man. Some loudly proclaim the happiness of the modern woman; others admit the fact that modern woman is not happy. Some say a career and perfect equality with her husband are necessary for the married woman; others discover through experience that the home can have only one head and a degree of subordination is necessary for the common good of the family. It has seemed as if anyone capable of holding a pen has wanted to give his views on woman before Dr. Kinsey says the final word on the subject.

In the field of legislation too it is obvious that the position of modern woman is a question in the forefront. Should women with small children be allowed to join the WACS? (The husband of a woman judge answered yes, and testified that the existing prohibition was discriminatory.) Should the equal rights amendment be approved, so that women will have perfect equality with men? (And, comes the vexing question, does "equal" mean "identical," and would women lose the special laws that protect them in industry?) A bill is introduced to allow a married woman who is working to get a forty-dollar-a-week exemption from income taxes to allow her to pay someone to take care of her children. (Fine for widows, it is argued; but is it discriminating against the husband whose wife is staying home to care for their children?) These are just a few examples within the past several months that show the necessity of having a philosophy of woman which is neither fuzzily sentimental nor archaic.

Our present Holy Father has repeatedly urged Christian women to take an active role in building a new civilization. To do this it would seem that they must take a lively but detached interest in all this discussion of their position; neither accepting without examination any and every new theory or piece of legislation that comes along, nor limiting their attention to the purely familial and spiritual with the attitude that nothing modern nor temporal is any concern of theirs.

THE EDITOR





## The Role of Woman

**Gerald Vann, O.P.:** Of all the trends characteristic of the world today—the increasing loss of wisdom and vision, of stillness, of nature, of the stability of home and family life, of symbol—seems true to say that they represent something particularly alien to the nature of woman.

Alien, indeed, to the feminine nature in all of us, men and women alike; the argument has been precisely that our troubles spring from the over-emphasis on the masculine in our world, the neglect of the feminine. Why then, it might be asked, sing out woman in particular? Is she regarded as being particularly to blame? The answer to this latter question is of course an emphatic *no*; nothing could be more foolish, in any case, than to try to decide which of the two sexes is the more to blame. . . . is not a question here of blame at all; but of opportunity. Precisely because the nature of the psychological crisis through which we are passing is what it is, woman has a unique opportunity to redeem the situation: she can, if she is true to her deepest nature, come forward with immense power to heal humanity, and in so doing achieve for herself an immense glory.

It is the feminine *Philosophia* who leads Boethius to the feminine *Sophia*, *Sapientia*, Wisdom; it is Beatrice who leads Dante to vision; the most obvious characteristics of Mary the Mother of God are her stillness and silence and her deep wisdom. By nature woman is not activist but contemplative; in primitive

society it is the man who goes out to hunt, to adventure, to make war; it is the woman, the conserver, who stays to guard the home. He is closer to nature than is man; she learns through her body, and especially through motherhood, in a way he never can. He, with his cartesian desire for the clear and distinct idea, may be irritated, at the conscious level, by the "untidiness" of the language of symbol: she is more likely to find it her own language. You would suppose, then, that in an age like our own, when woman is playing a far more active part in the life of society than ever before, the above-mentioned trends would be checked rather than intensified. What is the explanation?

### **woman masculinized**

The answer has already been suggested. Just at the very moment in history when the "feminine" was more urgently needed than ever before, to right the balance of a hypertrophy of the masculine in humanity, woman has herself tended to become — partly through force of circumstances (the demands of war-time society), partly, it was suggested, through a misunderstanding of the idea of equality — more and more masculine. The wars forced on women the work, and to that extent the modes of thought, of men; the struggle for equality of rights turned to some extent into a struggle for equality, for an equality which would destroy the differences between the sexes, and to that extent damage humanity.

"When we observe," writes Dr. Jung, "the way in which women, since the second half of the nineteenth century, have begun to learn masculine callings, to become active in politics, to found and lead societies, etc., we can see that woman is in the process of breaking with the purely feminine sexual schema in which apparent unconsciousness and passivity play a leading role. She begins to concede something to masculine psychology by establishing herself as a visible member of society... This step towards social independence is a symptom, even though it be only a response to compelling economic facts, and due to causes other than the actual need itself. The courage and capacity for self-sacrifice of such women is certainly to be marvelled at, and only the blind could fail to see the good that has come out of these efforts. But no one can evade the fact that in taking up a masculine calling, studying, and working in a man's way, woman is doing something not wholly in agreement with, if not directly injurious to, her feminine nature. She is doing what would be

**This article is a chapter in Father Vann's new book THE WATER AND THE FIRE being published in England by Collins.**



scarcely possible for a man to do, even were he a Chinaman. Could he, for example, take a place as a governess, or be in charge of a kindergarten? When I speak of injury, I do not mean physical merely, but above all psychic injury. It is a woman's outstanding characteristic that she can do everything for the love of a man. But those women who can achieve something important for the love of a thing are most exceptional, because this does really agree with their nature. The love of a thing is man's prerogative."<sup>1</sup>

### **male or female**

Let us be quite clear; we are here in a sense dealing with abstractions. Nobody, of either sex, is one hundred per cent male or female. We are all psychologically bisexual, and the two elements co-exist in every personality in an infinite variety of proportions. And vocation is an individual affair. Thus there are many women who, psychologically speaking, are predominantly masculine, and who will find their vocation and their happiness in a "masculine" career, just as there are many men who are predominantly feminine from the psychological point of view.

But when all that is said, it remains true that on the whole man tends to be predominantly of one psychological type, and woman of another. The primitive difference between the man who is the active hunter, adventurer, breadwinner, warrior, on the one hand, and the woman who is the mother and conservator of the home and the family, on the other, continues psychologically into civilized society. The man adventures in ideas, in scientific discovery and invention: he is the builder, the legislator, concerned with the immediate needs of life, with the rational ordering of life, with the building up of what is new. The woman remains the conservator: keeping and "pondering in her heart" the words, the experiences, which life brings, looking beyond the immediate to the ultimate and thus gradually acquiring her rich store of intuitive wisdom. "Her psychology is founded on the principle of eros, the great binder and deliverer; while age-old wisdom has ascribed logos to man as his ruling principle. It is this that can render so arduous that search for mutual understanding which we were considering before: "For the man, eros belongs to a shadowland; it entangles him in his feminine unconscious—the "psychical"; while to the woman logos is a dead, boring kind of sophistry, if she is not simply afraid of, and repelled by it."<sup>3</sup> But it is precisely this difference too which, given that mutual understanding and sympathy, can make the union of the two psyches so immensely rich and fruitful.

## Woman in history

"It may be said of woman," writes Prof. Guitton, "that her hour is not yet come' in the history of the world, although many signs suggest the belief that that hour is not far distant. That is not to say that woman has not played a primordial role in the human past, a role all the more essential for its secrecy. Man lives on the surface of things. He is at home in tempests and on the crest of the waves. Woman, on the contrary, dwells in the depths."<sup>4</sup> And he goes on to argue that, for that very reason, the soul of woman is not concerned with history," i.e. with the surface events. But here his language would seem to be misleading, to say the least. Even when we have emphasized once again that all this refers to the essential vocation of woman and not to this or that individual woman, it still seems untrue to say without qualification that because her vocation is to "inspire and sympathize" (as indeed it is), her function therefore is "not to appear in public" and that she "reigns in private." The essential qualification must be added: her function is not to appear in public, not to reign, in a *masculine* mode or capacity. The woman who becomes the hard-faced and hard-voiced boss, the virago-matriarch, will not serve us; on the other hand, what we desperately need today is that woman should appear in public, should reign, *as such*: as Mary appeared in public at the foot of the Cross, and reigns now as Queen of heaven. (It is indeed, for Britain, precisely a happy augury for the future that at this present time the throne which, as a result of the constitutional changes through the centuries, has ceased to exercise a "masculine" role, as it did for instance in the days of the Tudors, but has instead assumed a feminine role which can have profound significance and importance, should be occupied by a Queen Regnant.) When all this has been said, however, it remains true that, as Prof. Guitton concludes, woman's "being is more near to the nature of things. Her role, when offered suffering, silence or glory, is to murmur: 'Let it be so.' Her vocation is to wait, to suggest and respond, *to be* far more than *to do*."

So to Mary in her stillness comes the announcement which is the summons to both suffering and glory, and her reply is "to be it"; and her vocation henceforth is to live and work and suffer for the fulfilment of *His* vocation; and she does not command or urge, she suggests: "They have no wine"; when the time comes for Him to "go out into the world" she retires into the background, she waits; and when at the end He needs her comfort and strength she gives it, not by saying anything or doing anything, but by standing silent at the foot of the Cross.



The role of woman is to suggest and inspire: not to act but to inspire man to act; not to command and take the initiative but to empower him to command and take the initiative; not to save him, but to give him the courage and strength and wisdom to save himself. "An important section of the 'mythology of woman,'" writes Prof. Eliade, "will prove that it is always feminine being who aids the hero to conquer immortality or to emerge victorious from his initiation-testings."<sup>5</sup>

### **what is to come?**

The trend today, in the role and status of woman, seems to be wholly away from all this; and what then are we to think of the future? "It is not thus," writes Professor Guitton, "that we picture the march of human development."

And he quotes an interesting passage from Rilke, "whose genius was so prophetic": "The young girl and the woman will only for a time imitate masculine manners and modes in their own development, only for a time practise masculine professions. Once these fluctuating times of transition are at an end, it will be seen that women, in these often ridiculous masquerades, have only sought to purify their nature from the distorting influences of the other sex. Woman, who lives a more spontaneous, fertile, confident life, is certainly more mature, more near to the human than man, the pretentious and impatient male, blind to the worth of that which he thinks he loves, because he does not plumb the depths as woman does by reason of the burdensome fruit of life. . . . One day (to which certain signs in the Nordic countries already point) the maiden, the woman will come to her own. . . . Such an advance will transform the experience of love, today so full of faults, and that in spite of man who will first be outstripped. Love will no longer be the intercourse of man with woman, but that of one humanity with another. And this more human love (this love full of respect and silence, sound and sure in all that it binds and looses) is indeed that for which, in strife and pain we make ready."

If woman, then, is to be true to her role today, it must be not of course through abdicating her hard-won freedom, still less through rejecting her essential femininity, but by integrating the two together. And this process will once again involve the dark journey, a new birth. "As a consequence of the development of the individual side of her nature," writes Dr. Eleanor Bertine, "modern woman has partially lost contact with the archetypal woman in herself. This should be her conscious principle, as her grandmother knew instinctively, and it seems ironic that she



should have to learn the fact at all. Yet it is a common experience that those things which have been lived unconsciously since the beginning of time, may have to die, as automatic or natural responses, in order to be reborn as conscious, voluntary actions. This is probably even more true for women than for men, for the feminine psyche seems to be less centered in the head than the masculine, and so a rational understanding of the truths of its nature comes with more difficulty."<sup>6</sup>

Such a development, however, according to Dr. Bertine, is already coming to pass. "Women have learned the value of freedom, not only for selfhood, but for the fullest expression of love. . . . While men struggle with their own special problems in world politics, watched and often abetted by women, the latter are beginning to discover that something can be done, in their own realm of eros, to reintegrate the ways of nature and effect the archetypal union of Yang and Yin (i.e. of logos and eros) in human experience—but this time, on a more conscious level."

### **the education of girls**

If this is true, it shows us among other things the immense importance today of a wise philosophy of education for girls and women. The evils which at present loom so large in the education of the male are doubly evil when they are found in the education of the female.

The primary purpose here must surely be to educe and deepen the intuitive life of woman, her womanly wisdom. The time spent (or wasted) in school on chemistry or trigonometry would be better employed in opening to the girl, in a feminine way, the world of poetry, of the fine (and domestic) arts; in religious instruction similarly the emphasis should be put on the world of religious symbols, on the wisdom of the saints and mystics, on the art of prayer. Rational training of course there must be, in religion and in secular culture alike; but always translated as far as possible into terms of the concrete, the personal, the particular. Thus, for instance, dogma must be transposed into a direct awareness of the reality behind the dogma, into an intuitive grasp of the corresponding symbols, and into an awareness of the correspondence between the supernatural reality and natural values.

The mystery of the Incarnation, for instance, can be linked up with the human feminine mystery of child-birth, with the rebirth of humanity, with all the content of the mother-symbol; for woman is herself the symbol of rebirth and renewal, and she will understand the divine renewal of humanity if it is conveyed

to her in terms which chime with the facts of her own destiny, of her own body and soul, with the way in which, through her body, the Word is (analogously) to be made flesh in her own children who, it will be her business to make sure, are "to be called the children of God."

For today, as yesterday, as always, the ideal woman is the Mother of God; and today as always the vocation of every woman is in one way or another to imitate her, to share in her vocation as the mother of men. But to do that she will need also to share in the doubly rich personality of Mary who is both virgin and mother: she will need the wisdom that comes of experience, the wisdom a woman learns through her body, and in particular through her motherhood; but at the same time she will need the other wisdom, the virginal wisdom of the girl, the feminine counterpart to the "grace and truth" of the *puer eternus*.

Put into ethical terms, this latter wisdom means the insight, the sense of the true and the good, the faculty of intuitive judgment, which comes not from experience of evil but precisely from inexperience of evil: from remaining unspoiled. So innocence will sense the approach of evil not because it has known it before but precisely because it is unfamiliar and alien. So it will point it out, and shun it, because it will be conscious of its discordance; just as it will at once recognize goodness because of its own connaturality with goodness.

But if the innocence is lost? It can be recovered. St. Peter was made familiar with evil when he betrayed his Master; but through his sorrow for the evil he learned anew the mercy of God, and through that new knowledge he learned as never before to love God: and in that love it was God Who became familiar to him, and evil that receded from him and became alien to him.

### **the motherhood of God**

This is again a dark journey; but it is one which must indeed be creative for a woman who is to become, with Mary, a mother of men. One of the greatest glories of Mary is her making known to us, in her own personality, of the motherhood of God. We are taught by Our Lord to think of God, and to address God, as Our Father; it is no doubt because we need the sense of awe, which the concept of motherhood does not elicit in the same way; moreover, were we to think of God in terms of motherhood alone we might more easily form a radically erroneous idea of what that motherhood should mean for us, and might fall into the pseudo-religion of escape, of protection from life, of petting and rest. But it remains true that the concept of fatherhood is



not intended to exclude the qualities we associate more especially with mother-love: the gentleness, sympathy, understanding, tenderness. Is it not indeed precisely such qualities as these which are implicit in Our Lord's likening of Himself to the hen gathering her chickens under her wing?

A mother understands her children in a way that nobody else can: she understands them through her body, they are part of her, and so she has literally a sympathy, a co-suffering, with them, not only in their trials and sorrows but in their sins and follies as well. She cannot be shocked, because she is never surprised or uncomprehending: she knows. And this quality in God's love and mercy is something which we need to understand today especially, when there is so much evil and folly, so much hatred and cruelty and squalor, in the world. Men who will not look for God in His heaven may find Him in their own private hell, in the agony of their hearts, in the agony of their world. We need to know redemption in its living reality: the reality of God's descent into our squalors and miseries so as to search for us and find us and save us there. It is this that Mary, the Refuge of Sinners, shows us.

### **the age of Mary**

Thus the idea of these present times as initiating an "age of Mary," in which her personality, influence, and the influence of all that she symbolizes for humanity, will loom larger than ever before, is seen to coincide with that view of history which regards our own age as a period in which ultimate Reality is rediscovered, not (as in earlier times) as a purely transcendent deity, nor as purely immanent, humanity itself the measure of all things, but as both immanent and transcendent: transcendent because indeed the *Mysterium Tremendum*, but immanent because made flesh, and made flesh in order to share the sorrows and squalors of flesh.

"The eyes of the saint," writes Father Merton, "make all beauty holy, and the hands of the saint consecrate everything they touch to the glory of God, and the saint is never offended by anything and is scandalized by no man's sin because he does not know sin." The saint consecrates and sanctifies *because* he is never offended or scandalized (i.e. led into sin himself); and he is never offended or scandalized because he does not know sin (i.e. he has the motherly qualities of Mary because he has—or, having lost, has recovered—the virginal qualities of Mary, her strangeness to sin). If woman, then, is to share in the motherhood of Mary she must share in these qualities. She must have

the unspoilt freshness of heart, the untarnished vision, of Mary the girl: she must also have the deep, compassionate wisdom and gentleness of Mary the mother. She will need to be brave enough and strong enough to go down into humanity's squalors, and travail there for humanity's rebirth.

### **blue-stocking or possessive mother?**

And in so doing she will not only be helping man to find his own destiny; she will be fulfilling her own. For without this, what might she become? She might, at the other extreme, become one of those women "who despise their irrationality and are ashamed of being riddles to man" and so "become unapproachable virgins or blue-stockings, career-women or viragos." She might become one of the *femmes fatales* who are "merely proud of their enigmatic ways and moods and revel in these animatrics" and do not "acknowledge their deeper *need* of men," and so become "something like fairies or will-o-the-wisps or Helenas in whose life innumerable sex experiences may take place or none at all without this making much difference to them, because in the depth of their being these women are never really committed."<sup>7</sup> She might become a mother indeed, but the enveloping, possessive, destructive mother like the Borgia princess in the story recounted by Dr. Bertine, who, "night after night put a drop of poison into her lover's soup, and, day by day, won the wonder and admiration of the court by wearing herself to skin and bone in her indefatigable ministering to him . . . she had to reduce him to being all hers, like a helpless child, before she could pour out her tenderness upon him."

If she is to be true both to her age-long destiny and to her new-found freedom, it must be by accepting consciously and deliberately her redemptive role and preparing herself consciously and deliberately for it by imitating the Mother of men. In all ages women have been driven by the blind, instinctive urge of love to share the hell of the men they love: perhaps woman's new consciousness will now give that sharing a new purposiveness.

"Our abstract and violent culture," writes Prof. Guitton, "oscillating ceaselessly between the most subtle speculation and the most cruel of conflicts (when it does not combine them), is confronted with this dilemma: either to destroy itself or to return to its sources. This return to simplicity, to nature, to humanity, to being, to a truth commensurate with the heart, to the union of the mystical, the reasonable and the practicable, will undoubtedly come to pass under the pressure of diverse influences: and among them that of woman might well be preponderant.



Goethe thought that the masculine monad was often more rich and productive than the contrary; but, he said, since it desires to realize its content while carrying it to full consciousness and by a definite act of will, it is extremely subject to error and disturbance, while the feminine monad is spontaneously orientated towards equilibrium; still more, she draws man towards a celestial realm, she redeems him. . . . It may be that the new Adam, the man of the age to come, may, not after the flesh but after the spirit, come from the thought of woman who is alone capable of readaptation to nature and of re-establishing the equilibrium of a restless being fashioned for creation, criticism and revolt."

### **redemption of man**

In the Litany of Loretto we salute Mary as Seat of Wisdom, Tower of Ivory, Consoler of the Distressed, Refuge of Sinners: as wise and strong, as tender and compassionate. She gives her strength and her joy to Jesus the Baby; she gives her strength and her compassion to the humiliated Christ. The harassed, restless, neurotic, masculine world of today needs the divine motherhood as never before; and needs the human mystery of woman's motherhood as never before. And it needs the second to lead it back to the first.

"Who is this," we read in the *Song of Songs*, "whose coming shows as the dawn of day? No moon so fair, no sun so majestic, no embattled array so awes men's hearts." And the Church applies the words to Mary, the Queen of heaven and of earth. But it is that beauty, that majesty, which goes down into the dust with the Sun of Angels in His agony. If woman is faithful to her nature, to her own feminine beauty and wisdom and majesty, she will continue to inspire man to great deeds. But if she is tender as well as beautiful, humble as well as strong, compassionate as well as wise, and if in the strength of her humility and compassion she is not afraid to imitate God and search for man in his squalors, then she will fulfill her own vocation in all its glory, and she will do much more for man than inspire him with dreams of greatness: she will redeem him.

---

<sup>1</sup> C. J. Jung, *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 175-6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*, p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> Jean Guitton, *Essay on Human Love*, pp. 221-2.

<sup>5</sup> Prof. Eliade, *Mystique et Continence*, p. 44.

<sup>6</sup> Eleanor Bertine, *Men and Women*, Guild of Pastoral Psychology, Lecture No. 60.

<sup>7</sup> Eva Metman, *Women and the Anima*, Guild of Pastoral Psychology, Lecture No. 71.

# People Are People Are People



**I***t is a mistake to think that there are no differences between men and women, but it is equally mistaken to treat women as if they are a race apart. Mrs. Stancioff, who writes for INTEGRITY often, discusses our common humanity.*

Masculinity and femininity are symbolic qualities as well as physical facts. Eastern civilizations have stressed this symbolism more strongly than we have in the West. *Yn-yang*, the circular ideogram enclosing "the ascending masculine principle" and the "descending feminine principle" is a familiar decorative motive all over China and the Far East. In India the less subtle *lingam-yoni* symbolizes equally the "active" and "passive" forces of nature. This differentiation which so obviously runs through the physical creation is underlined by these ancient cultures to show the fundamental unity of life rather than to demonstrate division.



## by Marion Mitchell Stancioff

In many societies, however, this sense of unity gets lost and both socially and spiritually the division of the sexes comes to be emphasized. In agricultural communities where women work in the fields beside the men there is less social differentiation between the sexes than, for example, in military or mercantile societies where women are outside the sphere of men's activities. Here the "passive" feminine qualities are liabilities and women are relegated behind the curtains of the gymnasium, the lattice of the harem, or the veils of purdah. Wherever man thus divides what God has made to be joined together, whenever the companion and help-mate becomes an exotic treasure or an exploited slave, we find society remaining static and sooner or later falling to decay. There is an extreme example of such divisive regression in a certain tribe of central Africa where the girl children learn from their mothers a secret language which the women all speak among themselves and which no man would dare to or care to use. An imaginative Nineteenth-Century anthropologist thought he had found evidence of a so-called "matriarchal stage" of social evolution preceding the patriarchal stage and to this matriarchal system were ascribed all such traces of feminine exclusiveness. It has now been found that matriarchy—like so many dogmas of early scientism—is not an evolutionary stage but, like "momism," a local accident.

### **convention-bound woman fights back**

There is another divisive tendency, "feminism," which is as aggressive as "matriarchy" is regressive. One is puzzled to see a few feminists still breaking down doors which have been open to women (in the West at least) for more than thirty years. One is not so puzzled after studying the conventions of the Nineteenth-Century *bourgeoisie*. It is illuminating to read in the life of Beatrix Potter—the author and illustrator of the most charming of all children's books—that at the age of thirty-five she was not permitted to go out to lunch with her publisher, nor allowed out of the house alone until she was over forty. This was less than fifty years ago. Hers was not an abnormal case. Her father, a London barrister, was not inhuman; he was merely observing the taboos of the time in his social group.

In this the middle-class woman was the least fortunate. Most working women escaped such restrictions through economic necessity. Many women of the aristocracy, nurtured in the intellectual Eighteenth-Century tradition, ignored them. But the prosperous

middle class with its habitual readiness to conform earnestly embraced the new Victorian conventions. It did so partly to distinguish itself from the suddenly developing industrial proletariat, partly in reaction against the moral license of the preceding hundred and seventy-five years.

Moreover, in England the religious ancestors of the middle class had been the Puritans, so the spread of the Victorian code was the triumph of their own tradition. And the spread of a materialist outlook and of nature-and-instinct worship made the basis of morals shaky and in need of reinforcement. When a fading faith ceases to sustain morality society begins to substitute rigid rules. If one goes back to the works of Nineteenth-Century thinkers—and even novelists—one is likely to find them insisting on such severity and expressing such contempt for women as would make a Bedouin blush. The sphere assigned to women in Comte's positivist Utopia, for instance, is so narrow it would give a Kashmiri claustrophobia.

### **the predatory female**

From this aberration materialist thought fell into another. We know what a great gulf separates the behavior of Byron's uninhibited admirer, Lady Caroline Lamb, (or even serious Mary Godwin Shelley's) from that of Beatrix Potter born less than a hundred years later. As great a gulf divides the latter's conduct from that of her contemporary, the New Emancipated Female, Mrs. Anthony. The two conflicting lines met in the woman invented by that self-proclaimed feminist, George Bernard Shaw. He created the figure of the predatory female, full of deep instinctive wisdom, who runs mankind in the interest of a mysterious energy he divinized as the Life Force, and which others variously call Nature, Evolution or Progress. To this new, apparently conventional but really commanding woman the merely rational male is at best an instrument and at worst a parasite.

The theoretical division of bourgeois society on a sex basis (though active and passive roles are reversed) spawned the curious myth of the Battle of the Sexes. This artificial conflict colored much of our parents' thinking and has left a guerrilla mentality behind, that still breaks out in skirmishes and offers a pretext for all the stock generalizations about men and women which we have to endure. It was this spirit which gave the impetus to club-forming. In the Nineteenth Century the club had been an escape for men whose homes were grown dull because respectability demanded dullness of the wives who ran them. In the Twentieth the women, too, tired of their dull homes and banded

together in clubs of their own. This division of people into categories or groups is indispensable for work or war, but in private life it is a sign of barbarism. It is easier, of course, to lump human beings together under a particular label than to treat each one as unique.

The club spirit ministers to psychological lethargy, and we find clubs and societies both for men and women most numerous in darkest Africa and in those Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon countries where theoretical psychology is a popular subject of study and of conversation, which it never is with people who have a natural understanding of others. This oversimplification fosters group phobias and perpetuates the so-called conflict of the sexes. A friend who was invited to play bridge at a club of prosperous Catholic women assures me that the whole trend of the conversation showed contempt for men in general and that there was a distinct undertone of hatred when these ladies spoke of their husbands. They seemed to regard them as more or less adequate, more or less bearable, ministrants to their wants, and these wants seemed to be multiplied less to satisfy greed than to gratify pride, a pride in a strictly feminine world.

In this exclusively feminine world woman rampant behind frilled draperies stylizes herself to the point of caricature. She falls into three main types. There is the ultra-feminine Cleopatra type, a creature of moods and caprice, who wins her ends by wiles and knows no scruples of ordinary honor. There is the feminist Peuthesilea type who proudly struggles to outdo man on his own terrain and for that purpose chooses (like the ancient Amazons who lopped off their left breasts lest their shooting be impeded) to make a spiritual if not a bodily oblation. And there is too, and perhaps most of all, the "little woman" who assumes that because she is a woman she can escape the general human obligation to use her brains. Jane Austin has described her and Helen Hokinson has drawn her.

### **the freedom-seeking despotic flapper**

It was probably women such as these that Simone de Beauvoir had in mind when she wrote her book *The Second Sex*. As one of the most recent writers on the subject and one so much propagandized in the secular press because of her wit and style (and also perhaps because of the lubricity made respectable of the case histories which she includes), it is worthwhile to examine the woman-existentialist's ideas of woman. The creature she draws to illustrate her thesis has the character of an Oriental despot with the mind of a hysterical flapper, and apparently no soul worth



speaking of, for she is pure "immanence," wrapped up in immediate things. This woman is tricky and possessive, incapable of noble aspirations or high undertakings; she cannot reason, deludes herself and tries to delude others and is a narcissist desiring only her personal glory, yet needing to that end the constant attention of men. She thus drags man back continually to her own low level of immanence. She got that way, says Miss de Beauvoir (echoing the words of Louis Bebel, the early Marxian feminist) because man has not allowed her the two freedoms she needs to be his equal: economic freedom and sexual freedom. With these two freedoms granted she would rise unhampered and transcend *things*, scaling the heights of genius; without these freedoms she herself is fated to remain a *thing*.

And by the way, lest we have illusions about our country, Miss de Beauvoir makes it plain that the economic freedom of the American woman—though the latter holds a staggering proportion of the national wealth—does not fill the bill, nor does she find the sexual freedom of American girls sufficient to regenerate their natures. Woman's economic freedom, it seems, must be organized by Marxian methods (perhaps because these leave men little to be envied), and her idea of sexual freedom includes perversions and abortion. (No doubt "the Party" in its wisdom lets her disseminate her disruptive thoughts outside the curtain to hasten bourgeois decay, but she would never get away with such ideas behind it.)

### **femininity or humanity**

Blinded by the dazzling "transcendancy" of the male, Simone de Beauvoir does not see that the nasty traits she discerns in the female are *human* characteristics rather than *feminine* ones—as any sound book of spiritual direction might have told her.

She sees narcissism, for instance, in women's love of elaborate dress, and also in the illusions about themselves so many of them nurture. The realistic outlook as well as the "sober, practical and comfortable" (sic) male attire is to her the proof of masculine superiority. (This superiority will, of course, vanish as soon as her two conditions for woman's transformation are fulfilled.) Yet only a few generations ago men who could afford it decked themselves in bright velvets and embroidered satins and lace, wore wigs and powder and jewels. Perhaps it was the political uncertainty of a revolutionary age and the drab reflection of industrial monotony which made men give up their brilliant plumage. It may have been that the enclosure of women within the Victorian proprieties made them easier game and the male

no longer needed fine clothes to attract them. For now that the sheltering proprieties are gone, variety and color seem to be creeping back to men's clothing, particularly among the simpler people. In any case both sexes waste too much time and thought on dress. As for illusions and vanity, they are not, in spite of Miss de Beauvoir's opinion, exclusively feminine; no amount of the freedom she approves seems to have eradicated them in men. The only freedom which has ever been able to do that is the freedom of the children of God, and that is for both sexes.

It is difficult for a Christian not to be irritated by generalizations about people, nations, races and even more about "man" and "woman" as if they were essentially different. No need to enter now into the controversy over the presence of genes of the opposite sex in the makeup of each one of us. There is so much of her father in every woman, so much of his mother in every man, that it would be rash in the labyrinthine darkness of the human soul to seize on this or that as specifically and immutably masculine or feminine. "Male and female created he them" and woman is "bone of man's bone and flesh of his flesh." Man and woman feel so divided when they stand alone that they cannot rest without each other; but neither can they really rest together for very long. They are both looking for something beyond themselves.

### **Christian transcendence of sex**

"Alterity," as Miss de Beauvoir calls it—that realization of others which is the beginning of charity—begins with human love but cannot end there. Transcendence of sex, of human limitations, as she is at one point obliged to admit, is the peculiar merit of Christianity. She nevertheless repudiates Christianity, chiefly, it would seem, because in ignorance she believes the Church "rejects the flesh." (Eve is, she thinks, damned by the Church, when actually she is St. Eve, in the Eastern Church at least.) In spite of her intelligence and sensitivity to many forms of beauty she is a captive of the single concept of sexual pleasure. Yet she knows history enough to see that slavery to sex has always been rejected by rising cultures, while declining ones have wallowed in it.

In decay sexual morality relaxes, vitality is lost in preoccupation with its own origin, the source of life is muddled by being too much probed. Procreation is replaced by petting and pornography becomes necessary to stimulate the overtired impulse which once required stemming. Even the gods reflect men's appetites. Most of them have come down to us in their late and corrupt forms, so we find the primitive austere Zeus, father of the gods, in

later times turning lecher, and the virginal goddess of early Mesopotamia becoming the patroness of prostitution. Some peoples nevertheless have faithfully kept their ideas of the divine free from the contingent irrelevance of sex, thus we have the Buddhist embodiment of love, *Kwan-yin*, who sometimes appears to be a man or a woman but who is neither and is above them both.

"God made man in his own image, made him in the image of God. Man and woman both he created them" for, as "the Lord God said: it is not well that man should be without companionship. I will give him a mate of his own kind." The soul of woman is not a spiritual rib, a by-product of man's spirit, but a direct work of God. *Companionship* is the keyword in all this. Companionship, friendship, is the foundation of enduring and happy relations between people, and all the more between the sexes. Youth and health pass and so does sensual pleasure; without the sweetness of friendship marriage sooner or later turns to dust and ashes. Friendship alone is not enough to make a complete marriage, but without it there is no marriage at all.

Miss de Beauvoir is right in one respect: bring a girl up as a boy and she will behave as a boy, will observe the same code and enjoy the same games and, according to Beauvoir, she will be a physical and moral champion. Whereas, according to experience she will more likely be an everlasting misfit. And it is not much better to put the girl and boy in the same school, for there in daily contact both grow more conscious of sex, more deeply pre-occupied with their difference before one another than with their unity before God. In school let boys and girls learn the same subjects separately—or different subjects according to taste, need and capacity. Both women and men need to know as much as they can of the history and geography of their earthly home. Men as well as women need practical skills to make home life better. But in matters of the heart and mind, in the things of the spirit, boys and girls need to have the same outlook on life and marriage if they are to agree in it. *Not the school but the family, where both sexes are present, is God's cure for our tendency to divisiveness.* In the family one learns companionship and from the earliest youth boys and girls should be brought up to understand its value. So much, almost everything, in education depends on the family atmosphere.

### **in the family**

Children growing up in a house of strife unconsciously take sides, beginning to fear or despise one parent or the other and by



extension the members of that parent's sex. Thus we find girls afraid of all men, boys hating women. If on the other hand there is no Battle of the Sexes but true companionship between their parents, if day in day out through the years they see their parents honorably and reliably facing life together, without lies, subterfuges or any sign of exploitation, but with mutual tenderness and unflinching respect, there is a good chance those boys and girls will choose partners of upstanding character and will make happy marriages. People used to recognize—before a pseudo-democratic hypnosis made us incapable of differentiation—"good" families, and this did not mean that they were wealthy or famous in any way, but simply that there was in those families a tradition of honor and decency and responsibility, of firmness when necessary and of gentleness when possible, of hardness on oneself and of generosity to others. This tradition constantly observed in practice prepared the boys and girls who lived in these families to be faithful friends, true spouses, honest citizens and eventual inhabitants of heaven. Boys and girls, if they are to be fit companions, should in all matters of the spirit have the same upbringing. For the rest, that is for each family to decide according to circumstance and individual character; for brothers even do not often have identical tastes or gifts. It is a help to companionship if minds have had good training and tastes coincide; if not, it is as in all friendships the part of charity to supplement what may be lacking.

Companionship, friendship—from which prudence is never banished—should be the hope and aim of Christians. We must insist, if we are Catholics, on that which men and women have in common rather than on that which divides them. In this effort we sometimes meet with opposition in our own midst. This is either the result of a local prejudice or a misreading of Scripture. Those who favor "keeping women in their place" are fond of quoting St. Paul. They forget that although he was no feminist he used marriage as a symbol of the highest union of heaven and earth, and lest we take any of his practical rules for women in too narrow a sense, he adds: "Not that in the Lord's service man has his place apart from woman, or woman hers apart from man; if woman takes her origin from man, man equally comes to birth through woman. And indeed all things have their origin in God."

Although the disciples had the notions of their time and place regarding foreigners and women and some were rather shocked—as they later admitted—to find their Master speaking at length with a foreign woman at a well, yet the friendship of Jesus with the Lazarus family, the conversations with the sisters

as well as with the brother, came to be accepted by all the disciples except one. This acceptance of woman's companionship has had its ups and downs, but wherever Christianity has not been too much overlaid with foreign matter it has triumphed.

### **people gloriously unique**

For although man and woman have always been thought of as complementary they are not only that. If we start thinking of ourselves as "complements" rather than people we shall never take heaven by storm. We should never think of ourselves as this or that, never see ourselves as "writer" or "woman," as "leader" or "apostle," as "artist" or "mother." Such thinking tends to make us *act* rather than *be*. If we admonish ourselves to "play the man" (or the woman) we shall stiffen in the part. In life stylization is always an impoverishment and God's grace much richer than any role we may assign it, and each soul is in itself a world. We are each of us men or women, but we are all of us people, people with souls that are curiously and gloriously unique.

Yet each soul is influenced by the conditions under which it lives, and so in the face of the misery and degradation both social and moral to which industrialism and materialism have together brought people today, the Popes never cease reiterating the dignity of woman. For though this "God-given dignity" has been more directly attacked in the case of women than of men, it is but the consequence of a false philosophy which destroys human dignity in general.

Of all women she who rejoices in the name of Catholic is therefore least limited to a particular sphere. Her soul starts toward God from the same point as man's. Genesis and Judith, the Song of Solomon and Mary Magdalene proclaim it, not to speak of Mary the Mother of God. Men and women are saved by the same virtues, the same sins are deadly to both. Moses wrote one decalogue for all, and we are "all one in Jesus Christ." Still masculinity and femininity are facts of this world. Apart from our sexless English speech most languages attest it. *Virtue is manliness*, even when women practice it. (Pius XII has spoken of the "more than manly virtues" women young and old have been forced to practice "during these tragic years.") While *the soul is always feminine* in all spiritual writings. The feminine quality of passivity makes us ductile to grace, receptive to God's activity. And here with "activity" and "passivity" we are back again in our ancient symbolism which means nothing if it does not mean the fullness of creation.



## Edith Stein on Womanhood

**I**N this article, Father Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies, Seton Hall University, who presented Edith Stein to American readers in his *Walls Are Crumbling*, presents the thoughts on womanhood of one who was at once woman, philosopher and martyr. This article is based on Edith Stein's *Frauenbildung und Frauenberufe* (Munich: Schnell and Steiner, 1951) and is copyrighted by Father Oesterreicher.

*A convert from Judaism who became a Carmelite, Edith Stein perished in the Nazi persecutions.*

**John M. Oesterreicher:** "The Church needs us," Edith Stein tells the women of our day. Without us, there would be no Catholic Action; without our active part, our readiness, the family cannot be rebuilt; our gifts are imperative for education inside and outside the family, vital for the works of mercy; we are called to carry faith and love into the many fields open to us today, and thus to help shape private and public life to the word of Christ. The Church needs us, the Lord needs us, she says in glad and humble daring. Not that He could not govern the world without us, but of His grace we are limbs of His Mystical Body and it is His will that we be living members, ready to His employ.

"But did not Christ distinguish between men and women?" she asks. Undeniably, for He bestowed priesthood on the apostles and not on the women who served Him. Yet His love knew and knows no distinction. His channels of grace flow freely and for everyone; indeed, it is on women above all that He has showered His extraordinary graces, that He has lavished His mystical favors. And it would seem that today He is calling women in ever greater numbers to special tasks in the Church.

As at all times, so particularly today, woman must unfold and fulfill her humanity, her womanhood and her individuality, if she is to be ready for her calling. This is not to say that there are



three separate goals, for the nature of a human being is always *one*, and hers is human nature with a womanly and individual stamp. Human nature is perfect only when it is restored, reborn in Christ. Hence the goal of all, men and women, must be to give to God what is God's and to all creatures *their* due; to think, judge and act in the supernatural light of Christ's example and message; as members of His Mystical Body, with and under Him the Head, to work that His redemptive work may bear full fruit in ourselves and in all the world.

### **"for his sake"**

But mankind is an organism of measure, proportion and symmetry. It is, so to say, a double being, whose halves complement one another and only so form a harmonious whole. "God created man in His image; male *and* female He created them." And He made woman for man, "a helper like himself": his other half, in which he can see his own image and find himself again. Together with him she is seated above the other creatures of the earth, among whom there was none to be his "pendant," none to be his companion.

For his sake was she made; "for his sake": he requires her, else he would fail the meaning of his existence. Never could it mean that woman was created merely for the sake of man; every creature has its proper meaning, that is, to portray, to body forth, each in its own way, God's Being. Nor does the "for the sake of man" entail any humiliation—unless it is misunderstood (as it could be only since the Fall) to mean that she is to serve him as a means for his own purposes and for the gratification of his lust. Rather is she his consort, who enables him to become what he ought to be, a part she can play only when she accepts it in the freedom of personal decision. To stand at his side—not in his place, but neither in a degrading role which would contradict the dignity of the person—this is her God-given vocation.

### **mother of children**

However, woman's relationship to man is not the entire meaning of her womanhood; she cannot be understood unless one understands also her special relationship to the offspring of her womb. "Mother of all living," Eve is named, and she calls herself happy that God has given her a son. Honor and praise were paid, in the Israel of old, to the mother of children, of sons. The fame of a wife and mother travels far beyond the walls of her home, the Book of Proverbs tells. The well-being of the house and of all who dwell in it is her care; her hands are opened to the poor; her husband's heart trusts in her; even her grown sons look

up to her and heed her counsel. "She opens her mouth to wisdom and the law of kindness is on her tongue." Such praise is hers because she fears the Lord, and this is the secret of her strength and this the blessing that rests on all she does. Her high task, therefore, is not only to bear children and to see them grow, but to train them in the fear of the Lord. When she was expelled from Paradise, the first woman was given, to carry with her on the roads of the earth, the consoling promise that it would be her destiny and that of her seed to crush the Serpent's head. To fight the battle against evil and to train her children for it was woman's calling, from the Fall till the Mother of the Son who overcame death and hell, and has been ever since, and will be till the end of days.

## **the New Eve**

That at the doorsill of the New Covenant there stands beside the New Adam the New Eve is clearest proof that the duality of sex has significance and value in eternity. And when the Lord chose for the way of His Incarnation birth from a human mother, He gave us in her the perfect image of motherhood. From the moment Mary knew she was to bear a Son, she stood wholly in the service of His mission: God had given Him to her, for God she had to guard Him. Till the hour of His birth, her life was stored expectation, then devoted service and a close hearkening to all the words and signs which told His future road. Thus in persevering fidelity, till His very death and beyond, she shared in His work, the Co-redemptrix at the side of the Redeemer.

And yet, before she knew herself chosen, this woman, called to motherhood preeminent and peerless, had—contrary to the tradition of her people—renounced marriage and motherhood, determined to live free of any sexual bond. "The handmaid of the Lord alone," she gave birth to the Son of God, and though she happily obeyed the man given her for her own and her Child's protection, she was never one flesh with him. Forever she remains the exemplar of virginal purity. Christ too, of course, is in no way tied to any one creature, but His virginity is constitutive (which does not mean He had no freedom to choose but that there was no question of choosing), and in this He is lifted above all human beings. Mary's virginity, on the other hand, is freely chosen, making her the model of all, men and women alike; but in her readiness to serve the Lord, admitting no other bond, in the "Behold, I am His handmaid" which expresses all her being, it is a woman—it is woman who speaks.

True, the priest's celibacy also has its reason in undivided readiness for the work of the Lord. In looking at Mary, however, we do not see the Lord the way we see Him in the priest, who is His deputy. Rather do we see her at His side, her service being service given to Him directly, intercession on men's behalf with Him the Saviour, channelling of graces which she receives from His hands. She does not represent Christ, she seconds Him. She is close to Him not for His but for our sake, with her motherly love embracing the entire Christ, the Head and the Body.

### **the Spirit, archetype of womanhood**

"Is womanhood, then, as serving love, a true portrayal of the Godhead?" Edith Stein asks. And she answers: Serving love is help, comfort, given to all creatures in order to lead them to perfection, and "Love," "Helper," "Comforter," "Advocate," are titles given to the Holy Ghost. May we not therefore see in the Spirit of God poured out over all creation the primal image of womanly being? The Holy Ghost the archetype of womanhood! Its most perfect likeness is the Blessed Virgin, Bride of God and Mother of all men. Close to her stands the consecrated virgin, bearing the honored title *sponsa Christi* and assisting Him in His work of salvation. Yet the woman whose station is at the side of a man, the image of Christ, and who, through motherhood of body and spirit, helps to build up the Church, also represents the Woman of women. Therefore imitation of Mary is every woman's aim, but imitation of Mary is also the following of Christ, for Mary was Christ's first disciple and His first and most perfect portrait.

### **individual vocation**

This does not mean, of course, that the goal of all women is entirely undifferentiated. Our Lady herself gainsays such an assumption, for in choosing the virginal life, she departed from what, according to the tradition of her people, was woman's task. Like her, whose role was absolutely unique, there have always been women to whom a singular call was sent: in the Old Testament, Judith and Esther, for instance, who prefigure Mary, and later, in the life of the Church, Catherine of Siena, Joan of Arc, Teresa of Avila and others.

However, it is not the special privilege of a few elect, whose names history has preserved, to receive a particular call. Every human soul is created by God; each one bears a mintage distinguishing it from every other. And it is this God-given individuality that every woman must develop. To do so, she must have trust in her own being, courage to be herself; she must have confidence that everyone is given an individual vocation to a personal work



and no other is to do; she must listen for her call and be ready to follow it. All this implies faith in God's providence, for the road she is to walk is not one of caprice, but one willed and drawn by God. What counsel more timely than this, in a day when conformity and approval are among the highest aims of so many, when the goal is not to be true to oneself but to be popular with others?

### Three gifts

Glad to be herself, every woman must also be glad to be a woman. Three are the great gifts and powers given to human beings: *to know, to savor, to create*; it is thus that we are all a finite likeness of divine wisdom, goodness and power, and thus that we exercise our lordship over the earth. There lies in all of us the urge to intellectual conquest, that is, to make the world part of ourselves through knowledge; again, the desire to take possession of it with all the joys it offers and to relish them with reverence and thanksgiving; and last, the impulse to make it our own creation, by giving it, through our own work, new shape.

But since our nature is limited and even fallen, it is impossible for us to attain a perfect balance. The man in whom the urge to know is powerful, whose whole strength is given to one of the fields of knowledge, is forced to renounce in large measure the possession and enjoyment of the goods of life and likewise his molding powers. Or if, as farmer, artist or ruler, he seeks to put on a little world his own creative stamp, pure knowledge and enjoyment will tend to be neglected. Indeed, if a man is to excel in any single achievement, he must limit the sphere of his activity, and so his desire to be perfect in some one field leads him to one-sidedness, to a wasting away of the other gifts; and, what is worse, one-sided striving easily becomes, in our fallen state, a degenerate striving. Then reverence is thrown to the winds. Then knowledge is pursued beyond the frontiers of knowledge, so that the intellectual sight is muddled even of things knowable. Then glad ownership becomes greedy domination; thankful use, exploitation. Then creative powers serve but to caricature God's world.

### Reverent joy in creatures

The triple endowment is woman's as it is man's. But in general she has less drive, less thrust, and thus the danger is less that she will lose herself in one of the three gifts, that she will let the others wither. This shows that woman is called to cooperate with man: at his side, in the service of their joint tasks, she is to unfold her gifts, and the greater harmony that is hers will protect him from falling into exaggerated one-sidedness.

Further, her body and soul are not so much armed for combat and conquest; rather are they ready to care, nurse, guard and preserve. Hence, exceptions apart, it is the second of the three approaches to the world (that is, to savor) that harmonizes best with her soul; she is, to a higher degree than man, says Edith Stein, capable of reverent joy in creatures, a joy which, incidentally, presupposes a special kind of knowing, different from rational knowledge but nonetheless a true intellectual function.

It is this openness, this sense of appreciation, this gift of rejoicing with others, that fits her for her task of keeper and fosterer of the young. Knowing, sensing, the significance of the organic, of the whole and of the individual; sensitive where others are dull, hearing where others are deaf, she has her domain among all that wills to grow and develop. By her understanding of their inner laws, she is a friend not only to her children, she befriends all creatures; she is, above all, man's indispensable helper, a companion of exquisite sympathy.

### **to the life of Christ**

But where her virtue is, there also is her weakness. Unless she is on her guard, gladness may become gloating; her life may sink to the level of the senses, become spiritless and deedless. She will then cut herself off from the duties of motherhood, or else hover anxiously over her children as if they were possessions. Instead of offering her husband, her children and all creatures, the service of her reverence and love, instead of helping them to their unfolding in God's honor and to their happiness, she will hinder their growth and destroy their lives.

If a woman is to avoid these pitfalls and if her loving care for others is to keep its measure, she must fasten her life to the life of Christ. Allied with Him in the closest personal relationship, through real faith, firm hope and fervent love, through the sacraments, through a liturgical life—thus alone will she be a new, a reborn creature, a true woman. As the mysterious gospel of Paradise, the prophecy of woman's victorious war against the Serpent, intimates, woman has a particular receptivity for the good, even for the divine. But she will live it only if she longs to be filled with, and guided by, Christ's love.

### **intellectual work for a woman**

Like a hand from above, Christ slows to proper speed our affections, which, left to themselves and the law of inertia, do not know when to halt. The counterpoise in the natural realm is intellectual effort, work with ideas, or creative work with things, or work for the world at large: such concerns will keep a woman

from attaching herself to the lives of those entrusted to her, from meddling and immoderate closeness. All this is of added importance today, for the era is ended when the household and the struggle for bread were sharply divided between woman and man.

Is this new development, Edith Stein asks, woman's professional work outside the home, in itself a trespass against the orders of nature and grace? And her answer is "no." The original order seems to her to provide for a joint working of man and woman in all fields, though with a division of roles. Indeed, whenever the circle of a woman's household is too small to permit the full use of her gifts, it is only reasonable for her to reach beyond it, as long as her work outside does not imperil her home, the communion with parents and children. This limitation is obvious, for a man too, were he to increase his work to such a degree as to withdraw him from his family, would violate the divine order.

### **What are womanly occupations?**

Nor does Edith Stein think that there are any occupations rigidly masculine or feminine. But wherever soul, intuition, empathy and adaptability, are demanded, where the whole person matters: that he be nursed, formed, helped, understood, portrayed—there is the great area for truly womanly work. That is, in education, every type of social work, those sciences which have man and his activities for their object, those arts which depict him, business and government, national and municipal affairs, particularly where personal contact and care are needed.

Today, however, when economic facts force many into occupations for which they are little suited, there is nothing left but to shape what good one can from it: to satisfy, on the one hand, the requirements of the work, and on the other, not to betray one's own nature—which means for a woman who works in a factory, to offset the mechanical by her gentleness, her humanity.

### **House of Christ**

The home and the family is woman's first domain, but it is not the first domain of every woman. To limit women to the home and to measure their worth by marriage and motherhood alone is not the Catholic tradition; this is rather the work of the Reformation, which closed the convents and renounced the ideal of virginity. Christ was close to one woman as to no other human being on earth, He created her in His likeness as He did no other before or since, He gave her for all eternity a place in His Church such as He gave to no one else—so He has at all times called women to the most intimate union with Himself: to be messengers of His love, announcers of His will to kings and popes, heralds



of His Lordship in the hearts of men. There can be no higher calling than that of a spouse of Christ, and she who sees this road open to her will desire no other.

### **manly and womanly**

To belong to the Lord in free and loving surrender and to serve Him is, of course, not the vocation of a few elect but of every Christian, ordained or not, man or woman—everyone called to the following of Christ. But Christ is the ideal of human perfection: in Him there is no one-sidedness, no want; in Him there is the excellence of all that is manly and womanly, and none of the weakness.

His faithful followers then, becoming more and more like Him, will more and more be carried beyond the limits of the natures, Edith Stein exults. What no denial of nature, no human power or determination, can ever do, grace brings about in those who humble themselves under God. Thus saintly men often show true tenderness, womanly goodness, motherly care for souls, and holy women own unconquerable will and manly daring.

---



### **FROM A PUZZLED MALE**

**The female of the species  
Exists without a peer,  
So why in heaven's name  
Does she want to be like we're?**

# The Latter Day

A frequent contributor to *INTEGRITY*, Elaine Malley is a New Yorker. With her own nest two-thirds empty, she discusses, the "empty nest" period in a woman's life.

**Elaine Malley:** Middle age is a spectre which looms on every woman's horizon more or less vaguely and distantly. Today more than ever, with the modern accent on youth, it is screened out of our consciousness as much as possible by an infinity of curious distractions and illusions. Even when it is actually upon us, many of us tend to ignore its presence, aping youthful mannerisms and activities and grasping frantically at any scientific discovery, from hairdyes to hormones, that promises to prolong the effect of juvenescence. At the heart of all this make-believe, which is harmless enough in itself, lies a horrible reality. We are not only worshippers of youth, we are, as a nation, stricken by a sort of spiritual infantilism. It is no wonder that age is no longer respected. Robbed of its supernatural vigor, it has the effect of arrested growth—of deformity. Maturity and adulthood, and, in time, senility, take possession of our bodies, but everything in our civilization contributes toward the perpetuation of the state of atrophy in which we keep our souls.

One of the charming features of C. S. Lewis' *Perelandra* was the Green Lady's use of the word "older." She made it synonymous with "wiser." Of course, she lived in a veiled planet that had not been subjected to the stultifying breath of malice. Time and progress were consonant there. Experience was accompanied by enhanced dignity, for it did not have the implication it has here of contact and enlarged acquaintance with evil, so that the "wiser" man always comes out "sadder."

That we despise and fear age is an indication of how far we have fallen below a purely human standard of values; for even in pagan cultures age held a place of honor for its guardianship of traditions which had been verified and transformed by personal experience into rich stores of wisdom. But Christianity has bestowed upon age a much higher distinction, and it is because we are the heirs of a Christian heritage that the highest human values are not good enough for us. Sustained and nourished by a continuity of grace, the Christian soul should increase in holiness as it advances in years. The irrational and negative innocence of children which we prize and admire so much today is small and

frangible in comparison to the towering and triumphant innocence of a soul whose will to love and serve, sinking ever deeper root in Christ, has withstood through the years the storms and buffeting of the world and the flesh and the Devil. It is even overshadowed in God's eyes by the dazzling radiance of the soul of the repentant sinner, whose scarlet, through the compassionate mercy of our Savior, has become whiter than snow.

### **stages on the road**

The achievement of an adult, positive, willful goodness is the secret of growing old gracefully. It is not, however, to be won without effort. Every stage in life has its own attendant difficulties and challenges, which make or mar us. Those of middle age are likely to be more subtle, more oblique in approach because they are not marked by any definite physical or social milestones as other stages are. There is the child's first day in school, the first physical manifestation of puberty, the day of graduation, the wedding day, the day the first baby is born, and so on. But there is no perceptible first grey hair or first day of elderliness. Most of us have been middle-aged for some time before we realize it.

For the mother of the family this is a crucial season, calling generally for a complete reorientation of her habits of life. Sometimes a woman who up to this point faced tremendous trials and difficulties with remarkable courage and gallantry becomes suddenly a whiner, querulous and fault-finding. Frequently it seems that the lazy, selfish woman makes a more successful adjustment at this time than the one who has always put her family first. But this is only a surface judgment, for the self-centered woman, never having acquired the habit of sacrifice, has little or no adjustment to make. So easily, however, can a person's noblest virtues be put to the service of ignoble motives, it is possible that this habit of sacrifice, which developed so spontaneously in compliance with growing responsibilities, may have hardened into an instrument for making herself indispensable. To be truly effective the habit of sacrifice must never be separated from a habit which keeps the soul supple and resilient.

The most important thing a woman can do at this time is to face the fact that she is being called to a new status in her vocation. She should make a survey of her terrain and get her new bearings. As long as she clings to an "as you were" mentality, as long as she clings to the past, she will have no hands free to accept the torrent of grace that her new state in life exposes her to. Some of the circumstances to which she must adjust are: a change in her relationship with her children; an intensification of her relationship



with her husband; and an alteration in her own personal duties and responsibilities.

### **the young shoots**

It is difficult for a woman to accept the fact that her children are now adults. Sometimes this is due to reluctance to relinquish an authority which has become a source of personal satisfaction. Sometimes it is due to fear that the youngsters will make irrevocable mistakes. Let her remember that when they were first learning to walk she had to steel herself against rushing to their comfort at every bump and fall. So now, too, she must stand by and let them make their own errors. There was a time for teaching and warning and preparing. That time is past. Experience is something that cannot be transferred. Unsolicited advice falls on impatient and inattentive ears. The young people are too engrossed in learning what life itself has to teach them to pay heed to any more words. They want to make their own decisions and undergo their own trials.

On the whole, most mothers are generally content with the careers chosen by their offspring, as long as they follow a familiar, time-honored pattern. Marriage brings the expectation of grandchildren, sweet in themselves, priceless in the rich portent of new generations bearing the fruit of her marriage on to a sort of temporal immortality. Priesthood and the religious life are generally welcome, too, with a certain awed humility and a sense of gaining an ambassador in heaven to represent the family. But there are two courses which do cause dissension and unhappiness between parents and their adult children.

### **the apostate**

One of them is that of the *apostate*. Far from depreciating the discord caused by his dissension, it should be regarded as an indication of moral health. Parents are within their rights in condemning bad marriages, drunkenness, shady professions and other manifestations of ungodly living. Much of the present-day prevalence of loose morals comes from an idolatry of one's flesh and blood that embraces the sin with the sinner; an abject pusillanimity that pretends to ignore the presence of evil rather than ask open encounter with it; and a human respect that will go to any lengths to avoid being labelled "intolerance."

More painful to the mother than outward recognition and censure of her child's guilt is the inward knowledge of it, its acknowledgment before God. She haunts His judgment seat, pleading for mercy, and after having explained how completely she is to blame, she racks her memory and ransacks her conscience

for any additional scrap over which she may plead *mea culpa* and so find further extenuation for the guilt of the sinner. Every sacrifice, every mortification, every prayer which she can make to induce others to make, goes for his special intention.

Her concern is moving, but it should be tempered with realism. It is possible for her to lose her psychological balance in thus obliterating the limits of personal responsibility. God knows the extenuating circumstances, He is merciful, and He "wills not the death of a sinner, but that he repent and be converted." She cannot help suffering for her wayward child, but she must never allow this sorrow to disturb an inner serenity where hope burns like a vigil lamp, trusting in God's infinite power to bring good out of evil.

### **the lay apostle**

Another cause of family contention these days is the *lay apostolate*. In certain cases the youngsters themselves may be responsible for the disfavor with which the movement is regarded. Having seen the truth in a new light, they think they are seeing it for the first time, and they rush home, fired with enthusiasm to preach it to their parents. Much of what they have to say is an echo of what the parents have tried in vain for years to instill in them (such as the necessity for work!). This may be merely amusing or only mildly exasperating in itself. But it is sometimes accompanied by an attitude of levity toward traditions and customs the parents have always held dear, or by unnecessary criticisms of the parents. These breaches of filial charity may represent only an initial reflex, to disappear with the deepening of the spiritual life, but they may also be sufficient to create a prejudice against the apostolate.

In other cases, however, the resentment is more deeply rooted and no amount of prudence and diplomacy on the part of the young apostles seems to be able to allay the fear and suspicion with which the apostolate is regarded. It is so new and daring. Its very nature is incompatible with an undue affection for tepidity for conformity, for sterile inoffensiveness. It shoots like a bolt of lightning straight to the heart of the sickness of our time, a sickness which a self-righteous civilization has tried to ignore or disguise by burying it under layers of silence and pseudo-respectability. The mother must pass from revulsion at the exposure of its wounds, through disbelief that the sickness is curable, to the realization that even here Christ's healing mercy can penetrate, and that one of His instruments for our time is the lay apostolate. It is a long way for her to go, but at its end

es a new vision, a richer realization of the truths of our faith, and an incredulous gratitude that God should have chosen the son or daughter of His handmaid for His service in such a special way.

### **the man of the house**

Children are the strongest unifying factor in marriage, but there is a sense in which it is inevitable that they should come between husband and wife. Just as a woman when she is married must "think the things of the world, how she may please her husband," so a wife, when she has children, must think the things of the nursery, how she may raise her children. In many homes the man has a pretty sorry time of it as soon as the children begin to make their appearance. He who should be the first to be considered is often the last, if he gets any consideration at all.

Our national women's magazines have been insisting for some years that a woman should keep up with her husband *intellectually*—which generally means being able to discuss with him the daily newspaper, an occasional best seller, and perhaps some technical pursuit or hobby. Perhaps there was a time when a woman had to struggle to keep abreast of the cultural status of her husband. But it seems that today the position is reversed. Many men, geared to the industrial machine, have had to strip from their lives nearly everything not concerned with the business of making a living. They have had little or no time for the development of a taste for the finer things of life. This has resulted in a process of deterioration which has been very clearly expressed by John Stuart Mill: "Capacity for the nobler feelings is in most natures a very tender plant. . . . Men lose their high aspirations as they lose their intellectual tastes, because they have not time or opportunity for indulging them; and they addict themselves to inferior pleasures, not because they deliberately prefer them, but because they are either the only ones to which they have access, or the only ones which they are any longer capable of enjoying."

Many women, on the other hand, freed by home appliances from the heaviest drudgery that housekeeping used to entail, have been able to lead a more well-rounded existence. The necessity for caring for the children has brought out in them unsuspected talents, and kept their human sensitivities from drying up. Through the PTA some have come into contact with the local community and its problems, and have taken part in wholesome social activities. Some have used their leisure for a great deal of cultural flapdoodle, in the spirit of delivering a deliberate slap-in-the-face at their long-suffering mates. But some have spent it in



prayer and good works, with the results that it is the women who are the leaders in matters pertaining to religion, it is the women who *make* their husbands comply with their religious obligation.

This is a dangerous state of affairs for both of them. The man, to be happy, must be the leader; the woman, to be happy, must be led. Furthermore, a female-dominated culture is an effeminate culture, weak, erratic, inclined to hysteria. It is up to the woman to awaken her man to participation in a fuller life. Here is a situation to which she must bring the gentleness of the dove, the cunning of the serpent, and all the tenderness of her womanhood. She must realize that she has been granted special favors, while her husband, goaded by pressures from within and without the home, has been forced to overstress his role as provider, and in so doing has sacrificed some of his privileges of friend, companion, spouse, father, *person*. Now is a good time for both husband and wife to make up to each other for the years of service they have given each other through the children, and for the years of involuntary neglect of each other caused by giving these things their first thought.

If separate cares and obligations have not come between them, man and woman, if the years have only succeeded in bringing them closer together, then, indeed, this should be their happiest time. This is the harvest of their lives. They may contemplate the grown children together and rejoice in a sense of accomplishment. They may rejoice in each other, too, in a way which was never possible before, for they have learned wisdom with the years, and no longer expect perfection from each other—only the comfort of a deep and rich familiarity, the time-tested happiness of knowing all the ins and outs of the loved one's personality, and basking in his love and devotion.

### **the new status**

An important step in the ascent to a new status is the disengagement of the affections from the things of the past. In this direction an appeal is made to the inner consciousness for sacrifice at every stage of life. Sometimes the appeal becomes a peremptory demand, and a vital faculty, or a dearly loved one, is snatched away. When such a trial comes the acquiescent soul may take comfort in the knowledge that God Himself is taking a hand in stripping the soul of impediments and drawing it closer to Himself.

One particularly difficult cross that comes with increasing age is that of declining health and strength. A woman who has always taken care of those about her may suddenly find herself helpless and utterly dependent on the charity of those whom she

nce served as a matter of course. This is perhaps the most  
readed of prospects—the thing from which most women beg in  
their prayers to be spared. And yet it is a very special vocation,  
call to become a victim soul, and to share in the sufferings of  
Our Lord's Passion. So much suffering in the world is wasted!  
Here is an opportunity to make up for it by making an interior  
act of surrender, and by offering up, not only the physical pain,  
but the more excruciating distress caused by voluntary or involun-  
tary slights or indignities.

In fact, everything that comes with later life can be made the  
instrument of an individual apostolate. If I were asked to choose  
one word which best expresses the duty of a woman at this time,  
the thing that she can really give her time to with profit, it would  
be the word *rejoice*. This is the time of the rendering of talents,  
the crowning point of her earthly vocation. It can be a foretaste  
of heaven. There will be some trepidation and anxiety mixed  
with her rejoicing: she has not done as well as she could, she has  
made many mistakes. And as long as she lives she will never be  
wholly free from concern about those God has given her to love.  
But she should never let that concern degenerate into ineffectual  
worry. It is her spur to prayer, to real prayer and meditation, the  
keynote of which will be inexpressible gratitude, joy in His gifts.  
The hand-pieced quilts our grandmothers made, the innumerable  
knit goods—what were they but something for the fingers to be  
occupied with, a secular rosary—while the mind dwelt on God's  
goodness and contemplated His blessings?

---



## ACCORDING TO THE INDIANS

**Mother can raise a boy**

**Under her watchful eye,**

**But she'll never raise an eagle**

**Unless she lets him fly.**

# Be Present!

**D**O women have any responsibilities in politics? The Pope seems to think so; but many Catholic women are unaware of their duties in social and public life. Abigail Q. McCarthy, who has contributed to a number of magazines, is the wife of Representative Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota.

**Abigail Q. McCarthy:** If women are not interested in helping the helpless and the homeless, who will be?

Women are the mothers of the race. The Holy Father has reminded us that motherhood is the vocation of each woman born—married, single in the world, or in the religious life. Mothers are to cherish and nourish those who are too weak to care for themselves, to comfort those who suffer and alleviate suffering. They are to teach, to bring to maturity. They are to busy themselves with the housekeeping of the world—setting in order what that is awry, establishing the condition in which peace can flourish.

Yet recently a great group of women, a group which could rightfully claim to represent millions of women throughout the country, met here in Washington. In the course of business they voted down a resolution to support proposed legislation which would offer harbor in this country to 240,000 of Europe's homeless people.

It was a strange spectacle. The present president, a Republican, had asked for this legislation. The former president, a Democrat, asked for similar legislation. Almost all religious groups, including the National Catholic Welfare Conference, have supported it. And the moral leaders of the world, including the Holy Father, have pleaded with the United States for just such help. But the *women* turned it down. And the members of Congress could not help but notice that they turned it down.

The vote was close. It was reasonable to wonder, as the editors of *America* did, if an informed and capable group of Catholic women, alive to the Christian principle involved, could not have swung it the other way. Where were the Catholic women? They should not, of course, have been there as a pressure group. But surely, individually and collectively, they should have been there, eager to express themselves in the cause of true charity.



## here are Catholic women?

I think we have to admit that, despite the leadership of many Catholic women, there is a curious lag between the thought and performance of great numbers of Catholic laywomen and the social teachings of the Church. There is an even more curious failure on our part to accept the responsibilities of citizenship to which we are morally bound. Three times within the last few months I have attended meetings of American women, college graduates among them, who questioned seriously whether they as Catholic women should participate in the political life of the community, or whether they (mature women!) could safely join civic groups which were not Catholic.

Yet it is thirty-three long years since the bishops of the United States, exercising their ordinary teaching authority, welcomed the new status of women in modern life: "The present tendency in all civilized countries is to give women a larger share in pursuits and occupations that were formerly reserved to men. The sphere of her activity is no longer confined to the home or to her social environment; *it includes the learned professions, the field of industry, and the forum of political life.* Her ability to meet the hardest of human conditions has been tested by the experience of war; and the world pays tribute, rightfully, to her patriotic spirit, her courage, and her power of restoring what the havoc of war had well-nigh destroyed." The bishops were quick to point out the responsibilities our new rights carried. And they hoped for great things as their words testify.

The last thirty-three years have been dreadful in their heaping up of horror and of misery. What a world it might have been had Christian women risen as one to their task as preservers of civilization, had used their power to restore what war had destroyed! It was that war in which the unity of the Christian West was almost finally destroyed; it was in the years after that war that our restrictions on Asiatics sowed our troubles on the vast continent of Asia; it was in those years that selfishness, materialism, lack of concern for the common good brought about the great depression with all the evils which sprang from it. Can we say that we were present, as we should have been, when the times called out?

It is time that we examine our consciences. We must lay aside the false ideas of the place of woman and the false spirituality mentioned by Pius XII) which is so comforting an excuse for not rising to our potentialities and answering the need of the world. We must *be present* as the Holy Father has urged us to be.

## **martyrs, abbesses and queens**

We know that there are unnumbered women today who have suffered martyrdoms as appalling as those of Perpetua, Felicitas, Agnes and Cecelia—and suffered them as gladly and courageously. There must be, then, among us women called by circumstance to face the perplexities and compromises of public life as truly as were the queens of the early Christian ages . . . like St. Helena, Clotilde. Father Martindale makes almost a litany of the names of holy women whose involvement in the politics of their time made the Western world Christian—through them whole nations and peoples became Christian—Bertha of Kent, her daughter Ethelburga, Clotsinde of the Lombards, Theodolinda, St. Ludmilla of Bohemia, Dubrawa of Poland and that Olga of Russia still celebrated in the Eastern liturgy.

There must be women among us as truly called to government as were the abbesses of the middle ages. Too often it is forgotten that they had the responsibility not only of a religious house (sometimes as at Whitby a double foundation, one of men and one of women) but of the attached territories and villages as well.

There are women among us who, in response to the urgent needs of our century, can call on natural gifts like those of the great missionary foundresses of the last century and the early years of this one—the same talent for initiation and organization, the same ability to recognize possibilities in seemingly hopeless situations, the same possessed of the same zeal, the same understanding hearts, and the same concern for the children of God in all corners of the world. Think of Mother Cabrini. Think of Mère Aubert hiding behind a curtain to take courses in medicine before her time and ending her life on the opposite side of the world as "mother of all the people" to the Maoris. Think of Mère Jahouvey founding a Christian colony in Africa and supervising and planning the founding of villages, the digging of canals, the training of artisans, the improvement of agriculture.

It is among these holy women that gifted women responding to a different call today—and it is truly a call, the Holy Father has said it—can find their predecessors.

And there should be many—many of us whose duties keep us from such full participation and whose gifts are not as great—who must yet support these others with as complete a grasp of Christian principles and their application to our common life as we can command.

If we are to make this full contribution there are three things we must do. We must face the facts of the situation in which

God has placed us by causing us to live at this particular moment in history. We must search for the underlying and deep-seated reasons for our failures. And we must apply ourselves to the practical and the immediate.

### **The facts of public life**

The very first fact is that recognized by the bishops in 1919. In the century in which the providence of God has placed us, *woman is in public life*. It is futile, then, to say that she should not be. Or to say, as I have heard it smugly said, that Catholic women do not participate in public life because they are at home with their children. As a matter of accuracy they are not. Large numbers of Catholic women—they of the mysterious “third vocation”—are in the world of business or the professions. Large numbers of Catholic women still at the height of their mental powers, are beyond the child-rearing age. And large numbers of the mothers of young children are forced by the outrageous economic circumstances of our time to be wage-earners. We must be at least as realistic as the Holy Father who has this to say about the matter: “It would be useless then to preach to her (the working mother) to return to the home while conditions prevail which constrain her to remain away from it. Your entry into public life came about suddenly as the result of social upheaval which we see around us. It does not matter. You are called upon to take part. . . .”

The second fact is that not only is woman in public life, but she has a *right* there. As the Pope put it, it is not only because the times are desperate that women must enter political life. Her dignity as a woman also requires it. “She has to collaborate with man toward the good of the state in which she is of the same dignity as he. . . . Both have the right and duty of co-operation toward the total good of society and of their country.”

The third fact is that she is strongly urged to participation. Our present Pontiff goes so far as to say that *mysterious numbers of unmarried lay women in our time may be explained as the disposition of divine providence in answer to the needs created by the entry of women into civil and political life*.

The fourth fact is that women are women, not men; therefore they have a special contribution to make as women in the field of public life: “To reach the hearts of men and to take away their bitterness, that they may live henceforth in fellowship with one another—this is woman’s vocation in respect of public affairs, and the service which she, herself by nature, is best fitted to render” (thus the bishops in 1919). “Associated with men in civil insti-



tutions, she will apply herself especially to those matters which call for tact, delicacy and maternal instinct rather than administrative rigidity" (thus the Pope in 1945).

Are these the ideas of quixotic celibates as Father Wilfred Parsons, S. J. jestingly suggests? If we measure the challenge of the century against our contribution as Catholic women in the service of the common good, we might well assent. But they are on the contrary, the inspired words of our accredited spiritual leaders who pray each feast of a holy woman not a martyr in the words of the epistle of the valiant woman: "She hath girded her loins with power and hath strengthened her arm. . . . She hath opened her hands to the needy and stretched out her hands to the poor. . . . She hath opened her mouth to wisdom and the law of clemency is on her tongue. . . ."

Perhaps the chief reason for our failure to take part lies in our failure to realize the weight of our responsibility. But what of our greater failure—our failure to come with outstretched hands to the suffering here and abroad—as agents of reconciliation, as pursuers of peace, as refuge of the weak and the helpless, the homeless and the starving?

### **the faults of women**

This latter is a spiritual failure. And it goes without saying that unless the effort of women in public life is to be informed by deep spirituality it is all useless. Mother Janet Stuart, who wrote in the early years of this century and who is one of the most perceptive of spiritual writers, adverted again and again to the fact that certain positive and negative faults of women, scarcely touched upon in spiritual literature, have kept women from the mission. Of these the following would certainly damage the effectiveness of women striving to be present for Christ in the world: "The emotional current which is satisfied with feeling acutely and stops short of translating generous emotions into action." "Exaggeration and want of frankness." "Love of excitement, sensation and their strange manifestations."

The applications in the field of public life almost make themselves. Mother Stuart also lists negative faults which force us to further self-examination. Chief among these is "the widespread shrinking from responsibility and mental effort." She speaks of woman's tendency to drift, her unpractical (the word of a truly spiritual woman) selfishness, and of the want of perseverance.

These are personal faults which each one of us can check if we really mean to bring Christ and not our imperfect selves

the world. But we have a share, too, in national and group faults which require some perspective and objectivity to acknowledge.

As Americans we probably share in the general weakness described by George Kennan in his now-famous address at Notre Dame—that unreasoning distrust of things of the intellect and of the men dedicated to their pursuit. A strange weakness for us who call Thomas Aquinas saint!

We share in the weakness of American Catholics pointed out lately by such diverse and friendly critics as the visiting German Catholics and the Jewish writer, Will Herberg. Some of these weaknesses are the marks we bear as the result of having been, for the most part, an immigrant group practicing a strange faith in a new land. We are clannish. We hold apart. We are not as eager to share what we have as we are afraid of losing it. We have a passion for respectability that makes it hard for us to bear witness and to assume leadership in unpopular causes—the cause of justice for our Negro brethren, the cause of the migrant worker, the cause of labor's just share in industry, the cause of housing for the lower income groups.

Most paralyzing of all, perhaps, of American Catholics, and especially of Catholic women, is the refusal to take any steps in the temporal field without clerical leadership. This places an unfair burden on our priests who, responsible as they are for the care of souls and the administration of parishes, could scarcely be expected to be specialized leaders in all fields. Worse, however, than the unfair burden placed on our priests is the failure to grasp the duty and obligations which come with the lay state. Cardinal Suhard is most uncompromising about this mistake: "The laity have an irreplaceable work to do. They have their own witness to bear, their specific problems to solve and reforms to bring about, for all of which they are solely responsible. In giving them free rein, the Church is not making expedient use of alternates . . . on the contrary, she intends, and without the least ulterior motive, to reserve to the laity the full control of human society." We, not our spiritual leaders, are responsible for human society. On us lies the blame if it is not brought to its highest potential good.

### **What can we do?**

What practical and immediate steps can we take if we are not yet participating in public life according to our state of life? The answers which can be given in the field of government can be translated for other fields of community work.

First of all, is it not most practical to strive for quiet minds open to every value, concerned mightily for every man created by our common Father? The safest way to that, it seems to me, is living with the Church, praying with the Church in the liturgy. The great calm prayers of the collects, for example, are prayers of community.

Secondly, we must make the intellectual effort necessary. We must be informed about our local, state, and national government, about our history, and the problems of democracy. We must be informed about the social teachings of the Church. We should know, of course, the great encyclicals, but, as Americans, we should also know the practical applications of Christian principles to our national problems which have been made by our bishops.

It is work, but it is work that has been made easy for us by pamphlets, periodicals, lecture courses, many an excellent compendium. In the civil field we have the invaluable help and resources of the League of Women Voters and the National Council of Catholic Women.

We can learn at the same time by direct participation. One of the quickest ways to learn about politics on all levels is to participate in the campaign of a candidate in whom you believe. But it is important that this belief be based on the ground of reasoned assent to his principles and his stand on issues. Help is desperately needed in every political campaign—help in the multitudinous little tasks and details which women do so much more carefully than men: telephoning, addressing envelopes, making lists of names. Many a campaign these days—for council, school board, state legislature, congress—is run from the candidate's living room or kitchen.

### **the political party**

Eventually, it is important to join a political party. The superiority of the independent voter, the voter who votes for *the man*, is largely a myth and his influence is illusory. Every voter is independent in the voting booth. But the men or women on the ballot make their way there with few exceptions through political parties and, in the end, the independent has only the independent right to choose between a few offered him by the party. This country operates on a party system. To have real effect on it, you must work from within that system. It takes patience, charity, willingness to put in long hours at seeming trivia, but it is worth the effort.

In making this choice it is very important to conquer the tendency to drift into things. The choice should be made on the



asis of the party's record—not just its platform—in the fields of legislation most directly affected by Christian social teachings—family welfare, the welfare of the poor and the orphan, labor relations, racial justice, economic security, education, the relations of church and state, the distribution of goods, the farm problem, etc.—all problems touched upon by the bishops. In the field of foreign relations our choice should surely be on the side of merciful aid and constructive help to our neighbors all over the world.

In the state from which I come it is simple to become a working member of a party. You attend a precinct caucus. You attend ward and county meetings. You get help and information from party study clubs for women. And you do your level best to bring the best that is in you to bear on the problems and decisions of the party—ultimately of the country. You co-operate with others of *good will*. You work unceasingly to find a common ground. Your effort is not to *take over* but to help.

We Catholic women have received a definite call. A famous priest-teacher once said that Christ flung Himself once and for all into the current of our affairs when He instituted the Holy Eucharist. Should we, members of His Mystical Body, withhold Him by withholding ourselves?



*The emancipation of women . . . . . completed.*

This is one of the cartoons from **The Willock Book**, a collection of cartoons and jingles by Ed Willock, originally published in **INTEGRITY**; 50¢ each (or 40¢ each for ten or more copies). We'd appreciate payment in advance, otherwise we'll have to charge you postage.

Order from **INTEGRITY**, 157 East 38th Street, New York 18, N. Y.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### Impressive Statement for Conservatism

#### THE CONSERVATIVE MIND From Burke to Santayana

By Russell Kirk  
Regnery, \$6.50

It will be impossible for the thoughtful reader, whether he shares Mr. Kirk's opinions or not, to lay down this book—a self-styled criticism of conservative thought—

without feeling deep respect. The impressive bibliography bears witness to patient research and profound learning. Vivid and acute intellectual portraits of great men, as they emerge one by one, demonstrate his psychological gifts and sense of human values. On the philosophical side his theories and findings are of real worth and interest.

Above all, Mr. Kirk is a Christian. The whole bulky work is permeated with his sincere desire to face politics in a Christian frame of mind, to seek first the will of God in the building of society.

The writer opposes conservatism as a subservience to the workings of providence, to liberalism as the sin of pride of man; man who knows better and is going, at long last, to coin the recipe of human order and happiness. Russell Kirk deems it unrealistic and uncharitable to relegate to barbarism and error generation upon generation of past fellowmen whose institutions and ways of life are condemned without objectivity; without recognition of the good they may have achieved or the odds they were against. Conservatives recognize the wisdom of their ancestors—this was the motto of Burke whose great shadow looms over the book.

Conservatism yes, but conservatism of what? This is where Mr. Kirk's ideas are very valuable. He gives fresh life to the word and really bares its Latin root, *cum servare*, to serve with. This does not mean to preserve withered and useless principles out of force of habit, but to preserve life itself, to infuse new blood, not to mummify. True conservatism is elastic, broadminded, always reassessing its values; it seeks to preserve truth as it sees it. This was conservatism in the England of Burke as described by Tocqueville: "The feudal system completely transformed . . . the skillful infusion of new blood in the old feudal body."

Why then has conservatism failed? "Ideas, however sound, cannot resist the unreasoning forces of industrialism, centralization, secularism and the levelling impulse. Things are in the saddle." But also, "Conservative thinkers have lacked the perspicacity to meet the conundrum of modern times."

Catholic readers will be deeply struck by the case that Mr. Kirk—obviously a non-Catholic—makes for the Catholic Church. For him it stands as the truly liberal-conservative institution—always traditional and always readjusting itself to changing times and mentality. His eulogy of Orestes Brownson is very convincing and his portrait of Newman gives us a figure of really grandiose proportions, perhaps the real Conservative Hero in all the book—for he is represented as a bearer of truth in all the stages of his faith.

That the author founds great hopes on the Catholic Church in America there is no doubt, but he sounds a grave warning, echoing the profound French thinker and American expert, Alexis de Tocqueville. Catholicism in America must conserve its tradition in all purity and not

identify itself with materialism and democracy at its lowest. It must not preserve cathedrals and the trappings of cardinals alone, and sacrifice some of the principles of the Sermon on the Mount.

On the other hand, puritanism is very much put on trial and labelled as the great adversary of Christian conservatism in the chapter "New England Sketches." Nathaniel Hawthorne rises as a Cassandra, who knows the Civil War has to come. And with it will come the salvation of the Northern conscience, in massacres and reconstruction, the very opposite of sacrifice to truth. The bonfire erected in New England minds destroyed not only all possibility of American moral and political conservatism but branded these very minds with a red iron, a very scarlet letter.

The author plays safe with his choice of great men in the conservative line. They are the men who failed in America, who went nearly unrecognized. In his opinion, with very few exceptions, the great men of this democracy were all mediocre. The men of his choice would have proved his theories.

Mr. Kirk, who still holds some hope for American conservatism, expounds its principles and possibilities at the end of the book and it makes a magnificent platform. But this is where doubt creeps in. Granted the soundness of his principles and even the integrity of the men in power, the very elasticity and breath that he attributes to true conservatism must prove a pitfall to the frailness of their followers, who after all will only be human. The writer overlooks one of his first assertions on conservatism, that it takes a pessimistic view of man while radicalism takes an optimistic view.

Then, whether he likes it or not, the superior man, intellectual and thinker, in our age, is brought face to face with the masses, by reason and by force. He cannot ignore their wants and their overwhelming impact on the world, of which they are now conscious. Be it propaganda or sincere concern, this is the primary preoccupation of every radical. For the conservative, if above all he considers the first commandment and the obedience of man to God, should consider the second immediately after with intense compassion and constant attention. Even if the wise man knows he cannot chase poverty or despair from the world, his heart ought to bleed on this account. Dostoevsky reverted to conservatism but the poor could not, for a moment, believe that he had accepted their misery with indifference. One would like to find some of that compassion and some of that human message in Mr. Kirk's work.

But taken all in all, this is a beautiful and extraordinary book that may become a classic. All who read it will learn much and think still more because of it.

ANNE TAILLEFER

## Scholarly and Scientific

### SELECTION I

Edited by Cecily Hastings  
and Donald Nicholl  
Sheed and Ward, \$3.00

This is the first of a proposed series of yearbooks comprised of outstanding contributions to contemporary thought in fields ranging from anthropology to theology. The editors' particular preoccupation is the relation of sciences to theology and to each other, so they have tried to find experts with a universal view.



This first volume is very scholarly and scientific. The effort at universality is there, but not too successfully realized. I found several of the articles very difficult to follow because they were so technical. These were precisely the ones where a real synthesis was attempted, but a synthesis which leaned, in my view, far too heavily on the findings of experimental science as a basis. One of these articles, "Factors in the Stages of Moral Development," by Charles Baudouin, accepts the Freudian anatomy of the soul and tries to build it into a moral framework reconcilable with Christianity. This sort of thing leads to abstruse distinctions between the primary super-ego and the secondary super-ego, and finally leaves me far behind—and skeptical. Surely the syntheses that we are looking for will be far more lucid, broader, and deeper than this.

"The Reign of Anti-Christ," by Josef Pieper, was by far the most interesting article to me, though there were a number of excellent ones. I wonder why Pieper's article was placed last in the collection, with one of the very technical ones first.

There is an explanatory preface by the editors but it is inadequate. Next year I hope they tell more about articles and authors.

CAROL JACKSON

## Freud and his Successors

### PSYCHOANALYSIS AND PERSONALITY

By Joseph Nuttin

Sheed and Ward, \$4.00

In the beginning of Father Nuttin's book one is struck by the well-balanced, unim-

passioned critical attitude toward orthodox Freudism. There is a carefully reasoned account of Freud's philosophical views and his hypotheses concerning the nature of man, practically all of which Father Nuttin finds himself obliged to reject. There are two exceptions, which in Father Nuttin's mind "constitute a permanent enrichment of our ideas about man's psychic life," Freud's grasp of "the psychic nature of neuroses" and his realization of "the possibility that the unconscious may influence human conduct." Apart from these exceptions, Father Nuttin's rejection of Freud is practically complete: he objects to Freud's "interpretation of human culture and the human mind which, with the exception of certain highly suggestive hints, belongs to the shakiest part of psychoanalysis"; he observes that the "whole mass of ideas about this instinct for destruction (Freud's death-instinct) constitute a very shaky structure"; objects to Freud's apparent assumption "that the activities of the *ego* and the *super-ego*, as well as of the unconscious layers of the "id," are rooted in the libido as the only constructive force in the human personality"; again of the two meanings for "sublimation" Father Nuttin finds in Freud, he says one is unproven and the other false. All these criticisms are directed to Freud's philosophical position and they are unquestionably right in substance. However, as Karl Stern remarked recently, at this level "Freud is a sitting target." The important question is whether or not Freud made any outstanding and lasting contribution to the theory of neurosis. At this point in the book Father Nuttin seems to think that he did: "We have a great deal to learn from Freud the *psychologist*, but, to speak frankly, Freud the *philosopher* shows little critical judgment in the way he treats the problems involved."

It comes as something of a surprise, therefore, to discover that Father Nuttin ignores or apparently rejects practically all Freud's insights specific to neurosis itself and without any adequate reasons. Thus he omits to discuss such basic technical concepts as "dissociation" and "regression," and Freud's outstanding thesis that an unconscious sense of guilt plays a part in every neurosis, and seems to reject the concept of "repression" (the heart of Freud's theory of the neurotic process). Father Nuttin's objections to the theory of repression center around the fact that it does not account for the "constructive development" in normal man. But since the purpose of repression is not to account for the "constructive development" of normal man, but on the contrary, to account for the destructive processes in pathological man, Father Nuttin's reasoning here is irrelevant.

This virtually total rejection of Freud is a major theme running throughout the book, and the general effect on this reader at least is that Freud's specific concept of neurosis is a bad horse because it is not a tree. Actually Father Nuttin sees value in Freud's insights only as the forerunner and potential of ideas which were to come after him and which in Father's opinion far surpass Freud's.

In addition to the criticism of *psychoanalysis* the present book is concerned with the positive aspects of psychology, with *personality* and the constructive development of the normal man. The constructive development of the human personality is in fact Father's second major theme, and it is an achievement to which Freud never began to attain. Here Father Nuttin offers many ideas and concepts by way of developing a psychology of the "whole man" (one which is intended to embrace both destructive and constructive tendencies). In this connection he distinguishes man's "psycho-physiological," "psycho-social" and "spiritual" levels; the normal conflicts and tensions "with forces within him which are acting in different directions"; "the tension in question is *itself* the most positive and the most constructive force in man." According to Father Nuttin this conflict may result in an integration of the trends or a suppression of the least desirable one, and since no development is entirely complete, in some unresolved conflicts. Further Father Nuttin stresses the complexity of human drives and motivation arising from these different levels and so on, all of which are positive contributions to an understanding of normal man based on years of study and experience. And moreover, Father presents them in a way to make these concepts acceptable to the psychologically sophisticated.

By way of developing his twofold thesis Father Nuttin singles out and traces the historical development away from Freud's theory of repression with its attendant sense of guilt toward what we would consider to be an undifferentiated notion of personality disorders. In this connection he cites Karen Horney who defines neurosis as a "disturbance in human relationship" which in fact would characterize any kind of personality disorder, but which is too general to explain the phenomenon of neurosis. Here again he makes the point that a conflict between a person's "feeling of powerlessness and the 'instinctive drive' to assert" himself "frequently lies behind neurotic troubles" which, we would again say, is characteristic of normal personality disorders and not specific to neurosis. Here too, Father Nuttin describes the change in treatment which corresponds to



this new concept of personality disorder; a greater stress is put on the person's present problems with less stress on the early years; treatment is shortened and is often non-directive; and we observe that the guilt factor is minimized if it is mentioned at all. Among those cited in this historical development are Horney, Adler, Rank, Alexander, French and Rogers. "This change from the point of view which looks at man pathologically and in the light of his destructive processes," Father Nuttin says "seems to us a most important development in the theory of human personality. And we agree that the trend toward a positive conception of man is of the greatest value. But as we have said before, we fail to see how this positive conception is in any way a substitute for, or a refutation of, theories of abnormal processes, or a reason for rejecting them.

Quite apart from the question of Freud's theory of repression as neurotic defense mechanism, it seems that the most striking and most important difference between the development Father Nuttin traces and Freud's position is that Freud's observation that "an unconscious sense of guilt plays a part in every neurosis" has been completely misunderstood and hence rejected. It is perhaps because they ignore this fact that these psychologists are led to assume that man somehow can avoid neurosis suppress the undesirable tendencies and become normal by his own powers and without the help of *grace*. Certainly for them guilt is not the central problem as Freud maintained it was. And although Freud in his philosophical statements denied the objective reality of guilt, he observed the clinical fact of guilt in every neurosis, so that his position clearly implies the hopelessness of man without *grace*. But because he did not know of *grace* Freud could offer no solution. The Catholic solution (and the only real solution) of the problem then, is not to affirm the sufficiency of nature by denying or ignoring the evil, but to face it even more squarely because our power against it is supernatural and infallible. The truth is that of ourselves we are as hopeless as Freud thought and as incapable of achieving a positive constructive normal personality. As St. Thomas writes: "... in the state of corrupt nature, man falls short of what he could do by his nature, so that he is unable to fulfill it by his own natural powers." And thus it seems to us that with the right corrections Freud for all his attack on religion becomes more Catholic than the others who assume that man is capable of bringing about the normal social adjustment himself.

CHARLEEN SCHWARTZ

### More About More

**STAGE OF FOOLS**  
By Charles A. Brady  
E. P. Dutton, \$3.95

This is a novel about the life of Saint Thomas More and the great changes in Christendom which marked his era (1478-1535).

The author dwells overlong on setting his stage but once that has been accomplished, the book moves at a rapid and absorbing pace. He has drawn excellent characterizations of King Henry the Eighth, Anne Boleyn, Cardinal Wolsey, Erasmus, and Henry Patenson the More's Bonded Fool. A realistic atmosphere is given the book by the use of the ballads and colloquialisms of the day.

Throughout the book, however, Thomas More is an elusive figure who never quite takes life. The reader is impressed with the wit, logic, spirituality, and loveliness of More, but with all of this still wants to know more about More.

DORIS MILLER



## A Sense of Belonging

### BETWEEN COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY

By Thomas Gilby  
Longmans, \$5.25

### THE COMMUNITY FACTOR IN MODERN TECHNOLOGY

By Scott and Lynton  
UNESCO, \$1.00

I review these two books at the same time because where one deals with the Thomistic theory of social unity and congeniality the other deals with the application of well-intentioned social reforms to modern industrial enterprises. The first book is a commentary upon Aquinas' philosophic and

theologic views of human society written by a man already acclaimed for his ability to introduce pleurably and profitably scholasticism to a modern audience. The second is a paper-covered release from UNESCO which records the results of an international study to determine the effects of industry upon the worker's *sense of belonging*.

Both these books are essential to any modern library since they deal with the search for community, a search which obsesses the millions who suffer from mental disturbances, a search which has led one fifth of the world's population to communism. Both books highlight the obvious, yet generally overlooked fact, that however necessary and advantageous it may be for men to organize themselves politically and industrially, and however obvious the increase in security and production that may result, the cost will be too great if, in the process, man is lost as a person. However great the blessings they are not worth (in terms of human happiness) the citizen-worker's losing his sense of belonging.

Gilby (following Aquinas) shows that there is a normal tension existent between society as an organization of functionaries and the human body as a community of persons. (To make this point simple: consider a family of three. As organized functionaries they are father, mother, child. Note that within such a context the dissimilarity between the persons is emphasized. As a community, these same three people are person, person, and person. Emphasis here is placed upon equality in dignity and autonomy of rights.) Thus organized society and the condition called community being both necessary must learn to co-exist even though certain features of each appear to be contradictory. To maintain such a balance is the end of the art of human relations.

The UNESCO release shows that on the whole industrial society has been remarkably incapable of achieving this balance. Wherever industrialism has grown in the world, whether in New England shoe factories, Welsh coal mines, Italian department stores, or Belgian watch factories, community values have been destroyed—leaving the people with (sometimes) better living standards but yet with a deep discontent without sense of belonging. This loneliness and lack of stature is the plague of our times and is the basic cause of social and psychic disease. This study goes further than merely decrying the phenomenon of lost community; it investigates certain enterprises throughout the Western world where some success has been achieved in either maintaining the pre-industrial community or achieving it when it is absent.

After reading both books, for me the question still remains unanswered: "Can we have industrialism on the scale that we have it and still have community?"

ED WILLOCK

## Someone discovered

during the war that many industrial jobs could be done **better** by morons than by normal employees. Niall Brennan wondered what effect such work was having on normal minds and decided to investigate. He spent the next five years in a series of such jobs, supported by high spirits, charity and a good deal of courage. In **THE MAKING OF A MORON** (\$2.50) he reports his findings. It is, we think, a book after **Integrity's** own heart.



The life of a big game hunter is generally held to be more eventful than a teaching Sister's but after reading **SHEPHERD'S TARTAN** (\$2.50) by Sister Mary Jean Dorcy, O.P. we wouldn't bet on it. She is one of those authors who need made no effort to amuse, her pen seems to run laughter along with the ink. Just the same, there is plenty of useful information here on what the life of a religious is really like and answers to most of the questions a girl wondering if she has a vocation wants to ask.

Gilson's **CHOIR OF MUSES** (\$3.50), on the other hand, will be eagerly read by any girl thinking of being a human muse. (We hope others will read it too.) To be successful, Gilson says, she must be seen by the poet she is to inspire as altogether beautiful—and completely out of reach. The muses in his choir are: Petrarch's Laura, Baudelaire's Madame Sabatier, Wagner's Mathilde, Auguste Comte's Clotilde, Maeterlinck's Georgette and Goethe's Lili. These books are ready, three more come on the 16th.

**A HANDFUL OF AUTHORS** by G. K. Chesterton (\$3.00), essays on Mark Twain, Louisa M. Alcott (yes), Stevenson, Edward Lear, Lewis Carroll and John Masefield among others; **HILAIRE BELLOC** by Frederick Wilhelmsen (\$2.75) a study of **The Path to Rome** and **The Four Men** for the light they throw on Belloc's mind, and a comparison of him with Graham Greene and other modern writers; and lastly a new Lucile Hasley, **THE MOUSE HUNTER** (\$2.75). This is the same pleasant mixture as **REPROACHFULLY YOURS**, but with the addition of five serious short stories. We think them particularly good and naurally can't wait to hear what everybody else thinks.

*Order from a bookstore*

For more about these books and the rest of our Fall list, see the new **TRUMPET**. It still comes free and postpaid on request to Pirie MacGill.

**SHEED & WARD**

**NEW YORK 3**